



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,330	02/24/2004	Oilly Buxton	17209-518	9729
54205 7590 12/30/2009 CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER				
MEINICKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3684				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/30/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/785,330

Applicant(s)

BUXTON, OLLY

Examiner

Susanna M. Diaz

Art Unit

3684

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 October 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final Office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment filed October 5, 2009.

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 4-6 have been added, but are subject to a restriction requirement (set forth below).

Claims 1-3 are examined.

2. Newly submitted claims 4-6 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Group I: Claims 1-3 are directed toward calculating payments due each noteholder of a note issued by the first issuer and the second issuer based at least in part upon the data regarding the purchase of each note issue by the respective issuer and the data regarding the promise by the respective issuer to pay at least principal and interest on the note issued by the respective issuer. (705/38)

Group II: Claims 4-6 are directed toward calculating payments due each noteholder of the first issuer note and second issuer note based on each of the payment components [a default payment component and a non-default payment component] of the first and second issuer note, respectively. (705/38)

Groups I and II are related as subcombinations usable together. Group I does not require the calculation of payments based on a default payment component and a non-default payment component; therefore, restriction is deemed to be proper. (It is

further noted that the details of calculating a payment based on a default payment component and a non-default payment component would raise issues of new matter; therefore, it is difficult to assess if the inventions would truly be subcombinations usable together, species, etc.)

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 4-6 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Amendment

3. The previously pending objection the specification is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment to the specification and submission of new drawings.

The previously pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is withdrawn in response to Applicant's claim amendments.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are not persuasive.

On pages 12-13 of Applicant's remarks, "Applicants submit that in accordance with MPEP 2106.01, functional descriptive language is to be accorded patentable substantive weight and substantively examined." The Examiner submits that she has considered each and every claim limitation; however, this does not preclude a

determination that certain claim features might not serve to patentably limit the scope of the claimed invention. The problem is that it's not evident from the claim language that all of the received data is actively used to perform the recited calculations. Only the specific type of data required to complete the claimed calculations would be deemed functional descriptive material. For example, let's suppose that we have the following hypothetical claim:

A method comprising the steps of:

receiving data regarding a customer's name, phone number, loan amount, interest rate, and payment term;

calculating a monthly payment based on said received data.

First, using "data regarding" specific types of information to perform a certain calculation does not necessarily mean that the specific types of information themselves are actively used in the calculation. The quantitative loan amount, interest rate, and payment term can be seen as data related to or "regarding the" customer's name and phone number also. Second, the calculation implies that quantitative values are relied upon. The customer name and phone number would likely not be fed directly into a monthly payment calculation (unless the specification somehow showed that the loan amount, interest rate, and payment term were set differently based on the nature of the customer, as identified through his/her name and phone number). Similarly, with Applicant's claimed invention, all of the received pieces of data are not clearly required for the types of calculations performed (as explained in the art rejection). Any received

information that is not utilized for further processing specifically requiring that type of data is not functional descriptive material. Looking toward the Applicant's original disclosure, it is not clear that all of the received data would be used in the claimed calculations either. Process claims are defined by actively performed steps and apparatus claims are defined by positively recited structural elements and any corresponding functionality. Details regarding which type of information is received, for example, only serve to patentably limit the scope of a process claim if the specific type of information affects how a manipulative step of the invention is performed. For an apparatus claim, such data must affect a structural element (e.g., in the operation of the structural element). Contractual terms will only serve to patentably limit the claimed invention to the extent that certain terms affect the manner in which a manipulative step (e.g., a calculation step) is performed in a process claim or how a structural element operates in an apparatus claim.

Furthermore, "Applicants request clarification as to how the claimed element are equivalent to music, literary works, or a compilation or mere arrangement of data, as identified in MPEP 2106.01 as non-functional descriptive materials as discussed in the MPEP 2106.01." (Page 13 of Applicant's remarks) The Examiner submits that the claimed non-functional descriptive material in Applicant's case would be a mere compilation of data. Further explanation has been provided above.

It is further noted that, while Applicant's specification is 145 pages long, only pages 1-2 discuss any functionality that is performed by hardware/software. Pages 1-2 also lay some groundwork for the existence of various parties handling the sale of

notes. Pages 3-145 provide a laundry list of (sometimes disjointed) contract terms. It is difficult to ascertain which calculations are envisioned by Applicant as being performed in relation to each and every contract term. For example, most of the disclosed contract terms do not appear to be the type of information that is fed directly into the claimed calculations. Barring an explicit disclosure of how all of the recited received data is used to directly calculate the various recited payments, the Examiner has reason to reasonably ascertain that only certain recited quantitative information is utilized to complete such calculations.

On page 13 of Applicant's remarks, "Applicants respectfully submit Bahar's 'system for auctioning bad debts,' (Bahar, Abstract, line 1) does not discuss at least the claimed '...calculating...payments due each noteholder of a note issued by the first issuer based at least in part upon the data regarding the purchase of each note issued by the first issuer and the data regarding the promise by the first issuer to pay at least principal and interest on the note issued by the first issuer...' as recited in independent claim 1. In contrast, Bahar discusses 'creditors may sell bad debts they own by being able to easily and more effectively, locate buyers who are situated in or near a territorial location that has jurisdiction over the debtor,' (Bahar, Abstract, lines 11-14)." As explained above, the claims do not clearly explain if or how all of the received data would be used directly in the recited calculations. Also, using data "regarding" other information does not necessarily mean that the information *per se* is fed directly into the calculation. Applicant's claims do not clarify which specific piece(s) of the "data regarding the purchase of each note issued by the first issuer" and which piece(s) of the

"data regarding the promise by the first issuer to pay at least principal and interest on the note issued by the first issuer" are needed to complete the calculations of payments due. Also, a promise to pay at least principal and interest does not necessarily mean that the principal and interest themselves are used in the payment calculations. At present, a broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims means that any type of data used to perform payment calculations "regarding" (or "related to") the type of recited transactions would read on the claimed calculations. Until Applicant clearly amends the claims to specify which particular data is utilized to perform the recited calculations (with proper support from the original disclosure), this broadest reasonable interpretation is valid. Applicant has yet to point out which specific data they desire to be used in these calculations. For example, one cannot calculate payment amount based on a promise *per se*; therefore, a broadest reasonable interpretation would provide for any type of quantitative data reasonably related to such a promise to be utilized for the respective calculations within the scope of the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that Bahar's payment calculations are based on the amount of the winning bid and not the claimed data, yet Applicant does not limit their claimed data to specific data beyond any data needed to calculate a payment, the broad scope of which the Examiner maintains is addressed by the Bahar-Rutter combination.

Oath/Declaration

5. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahar (US 2002/0143687 A1) in view of Rutter, James. "Repackaging of All Kinds of Credits." Euromoney. London, Issue 339, Page 29, July 1997.

Bahar discloses a method implemented by a programmed computer system, comprising:

[Claim 1] receiving by a computer system data regarding a first issuer bound by regulations of a first jurisdiction (Figs. 2, 4(b), 4(c), 5; ¶¶ 18, 19, 21, 31-33, 38-39, 43);

receiving by the computer system data regarding a second issuer bound by regulations of a second jurisdiction, wherein the first jurisdiction and the second jurisdiction are distinct from one another (Figs. 2, 4(b), 4(c), 5; ¶¶ 18, 19, 21, 31-33, 38-

39, 43 – In Fig. 4(b), items 1 and 2 fall under the jurisdiction of New York, NY, while Item 3 falls under New York, NY, Hackensack, NJ, and/or Miami, FL);

receiving by the computer system data regarding a first multi-jurisdictional program contract entered into between the first issuer acting as a debtor and at least one multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty for sale of at least one note issued by the first issuer, wherein each first multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty is selected from the group consisting of: a trustee, a principal paying agent, a custodian, a paying agent, a transfer agent, an arranger, a calculation agent, a disposal agent, a process agent and a swap counterparty (Figs. 2, 4(b), 4(c), 5; ¶¶ 18, 19, 21, 31-33, 38-39, 43 – The specific type of counterparty does not affect the structural elements or the manipulative steps of the claimed invention and therefore will not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, as discussed in more detail below);

receiving by the computer system data regarding a second multi-jurisdictional program contract entered into between the second issuer acting as a debtor and at least one multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty for the sale of at least one note issued by the second issuer, wherein each second multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty is selected from the group consisting of: a trustee, a principal paying agent, a custodian, a paying agent, a transfer agent, an arranger, a calculation agent, a disposal agent, a process agent and a swap counterparty (Figs. 2, 4(b), 4(c), 5; ¶¶ 18, 19, 21, 31-33, 38-39, 43 – The specific type of counterparty does not affect the structural elements or the manipulative steps of the claimed invention and therefore will

not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, as discussed in more detail below);

receiving by the computer system data regarding the purchase of each note by a noteholder (¶¶ 29-37 – Bids to purchase each note are entered);

calculating by the computer system payments due each noteholder based at least in part upon the input data regarding the purchase of each note (¶¶ 29-37 – Bids to purchase each note are entered. The winning bid indicates payments due upon purchase of each note);

processing the calculated payments by the computer system to provide the payments to the noteholders (¶¶ 35, 37 -- Bad debt items are sold to the winning bidder, thereby implying that payments to the noteholders are made in exchange for the bad debt items);

[Claim 2] wherein each first multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty is the same entity as each corresponding second multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty (Fig. 4(b); ¶¶ 31-33 – A single party may purchase various bad debt items in the form of a lot);

[Claim 3] wherein the steps are carried out in the order recited (Figs. 6(a)-6(c)).

It is noted that most of the details recited in claims 1-3 do not affect the scope of the manipulative steps of the invention. The first four steps of independent claim 1 involve the steps of receiving data with a computer; however, the details of the data amount to non-functional descriptive material. Even though Bahar does not explicitly

disclose all of the details of the received data, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the manipulative steps of the invention nor do they alter the recited structural elements; therefore, such differences do not effectively serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The manipulative steps of the invention would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability as the claimed invention fails to present a new and unobvious functional relationship between the descriptive material and the substrate, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994)); *In re Ngai*, 367 F.3d 1336, 1336, 70 USPQ2d 1862, 1863-64 (Fed. Cir. 2004); MPEP § 2106. For example, the fact that the first and second issuers act as debtors has no bearing on how data is received in the first four limitations of claim 1 nor is the received data in the first four limitations specifically used to perform any subsequent functionality that is intrinsically dependent on the particular type of data received in the first four limitations of claim 1. The fifth step of "receiving with a computer data regarding the purchase of each note by a noteholder" does require purchase data that is subsequently utilized in the calculating steps since the received purchase data is specifically used to calculate payments due each noteholder; however, only the data needed to perform the recited calculations is functional, descriptive material. In both steps of calculating, payments due each noteholder of a note issued by the first issuer and payments due each

noteholder of a note issued by the second issuer are calculated. Out of the recited contractual details, the only contributing quantitative values (in terms of calculating payments due) are principal and interest on each respective note. The nature of the owner of the debt does not affect the actual calculations themselves.

Nevertheless, the Examiner submits that the contractual details recited in claim 1 may effectively be directly toward the use of a special purpose vehicle (special purpose entity) to repackage debt securities. Rutter discusses an arrangement in which a special purpose vehicle is established to repackage debt obligations and sell them as notes (Rutter: ¶¶ 7, 9, 11, 14, 17). The benefit of such an arrangement is that it passes on the risks of the assets to the investor, but in a manner that is more "palatable" to the investor (Rutter: ¶ 11). "Snap [the structured note asset packaging vehicle] purchases the underlying securities, which are held in trust by Chase. It then enters into a basis swap with ING Barings, exchanging the cash flows on the loans for the cash flows needed to match payments on the bonds." (Rutter: ¶ 11) According to Rutter, "Snap was one of the first vehicles to have a trust structure allowing it to ringfence underlying assets into separate new issues. 'There is no risk of other securities polluting the issue,' says Thomas. This gives the programme added flexibility, and investors the exact risk profile they seek." (Rutter: ¶ 7) In this scenario, Snap effectively becomes an issuer for each debt and ING Barings becomes the counterparty (more particularly, a swap counterparty). By "exchanging the cash flows on the loans for the cash flows needed to match payments on the bonds" (Rutter: ¶ 11), Snap is effectively acting as a debtor that promises to pay at least principal and interest on the note it issued. Both Bahar and

Art Unit: 3684

Rutter seek to make securitized debt (which implies debt and principal repayment) a more enticing investment for investors; therefore, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Bahar's debt securitization process to go through a special purpose vehicle/entity (as taught by Rutter) such that the first and second issuers each, in acting as a debtor, promise to pay at least principal and interest on the note issued by the first/second issuer, wherein the data regarding the first/second multi-jurisdictional program contract includes the promise by the first/second issuer to pay at least principal and interest on the note issued by the first/second issuer and wherein each first/second multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty is selected from the group consisting of a trustee, a principal paying agent, a custodian, a paying agent, a transfer agent, an arranger, a calculation agent, a disposal agent, a process agent and a swap counterparty and calculating with a computer payments due each noteholder of a note issued by the first/second issuer based at least in part upon the data regarding the purchase of each note issued by the first/second issuer and the data regarding the promise by the first/second issuer to pay at least principal and interest on the note issued by the first/second issuer (claim 1) in order to assist an original owner of debt in convincing investors to purchase a securitized form of the debt (as explained in Rutter) while shielding the original owner of debt from excessive risk through use of the special purpose entity/vehicle (which is a well-known advantage of establishing special purpose entities/vehicles). Furthermore, Bahar specifically addresses the concern that arises in enforcing debt obligations in multiple jurisdictions while Rutter describes various

international transactions, thereby lending further support to Examiner's assertion that both references handle analogous types of transactions and each reference provides solutions that are pertinent to the problems presented in the other reference.

Claim 2 clarifies that "each first multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty is the same entity as each corresponding second multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty"; however, the nature of the counterparties does not have any bearing on how the manipulative steps of the invention are performed. Furthermore, many of the recited claim details merely reflect contractual terms and agreements. Beyond receiving various pieces of data, the main manipulative steps of the claimed invention involve calculating payment due each noteholder and processing the calculated payments to the noteholders. To perform these manipulative steps of the claimed invention, only "data regarding the purchase of each note by a noteholder" is required to complete the recited calculation. The nature of the various entities recited does not affect how data is received or any of the calculations or processing of payments; therefore, the descriptive details of the recited entities will not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art unless such descriptive details are somehow recited in a manner that is specifically crucial to the operation of a manipulative step or steps of the claimed invention. Nevertheless, in one of Rutter's scenarios, ING Barings is the swap counterparty for all of the swaps with Snap (Rutter: ¶ 11), thereby implying that ING Barings is the same contract counterparty for two or more transactions. Both Bahar and Rutter seek to make securitized debt (which implies debt and principal repayment) a more enticing investment for investors; therefore, the

Art Unit: 3684

Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Bahar's debt securitization process to go through a special purpose vehicle/entity (as taught by Rutter) such that each first multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty is the same entity as each corresponding second multi-jurisdictional program contract counterparty in order to assist an original owner of debt in convincing investors to purchase a securitized form of the debt (as explained in Rutter) while shielding the original owner of debt from excessive risk through use of the special purpose entity/vehicle (which is a well-known advantage of establishing special purpose entities/vehicles) and promoting good business relationships among entities that commonly work together.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-3 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of copending Application No. 11/175,501. Claims 1-3 of the instant application are fully anticipated by claims 1-6 of copending Application No. 11/175,501. Elimination of an element or its functions is deemed to be obvious in light of prior art teachings of at least the recited element or its functions (see *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184, 186; 311 F2d 581 (CCPA 1963)).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susanna M. Diaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-6733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached on (571) 272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susanna M. Diaz/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3684